

EMPLOYEE VIEWS OF ACADEMICS (STANDARDS, PERFORMANCE, AND
INTEGRITY), GOVERNANCE, AND FINANCE OF INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS AT
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA AT CHAPEL HILL

Gregory S. Lewinter

A thesis proposal submitted to the faculty of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in
partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Department of
Exercise and Sport Science (Sport Administration).

Chapel Hill
2013

Approved by:

Erianne Weight, Ph.D.

Barbara Osborne, J.D.

Mr. John Brunner, M.A

ABSTRACT

GREGORY S. LEWINTER: Employee Views of Academics (Standards, Performance, Integrity), Finance, and Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
(Under the direction of Dr. Erianne Weight)

As intercollegiate athletics continue to evolve, there continue to be calls for reform from faculty on both the campus and national levels. Scholarly inquiries into faculty perceptions and satisfaction levels pertaining to intercollegiate athletics have provided valuable insight into the variation between campuses as study results have not been uniform (Putler & Wolfe, 1999). With differing beliefs, each faculty-led reform group has a different agenda and set of guiding principles.

The purpose of this study is to examine all UNC-CH employees' satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH. This will extend the 2006 Knight Commission sponsored study, *Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics: A National Study of Faculty at NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) Institutions* to gather preliminary data using a survey for all UNC-CH employees pertaining specifically to satisfaction with academics, governance, and finance of athletics at UNC-CH.

In order to guide the examination of employee satisfaction of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH, this study was framed utilizing three philosophical viewpoints, which describe basic faculty issues and assumptions that divide institutional reformers and reform groups within Division I institutions across the country (Sack, 2009). The presentation will discuss the findings of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
---------------------	----

Chapter

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
	Statement of Purpose.....	2
	Research Questions.....	2
	Definition of Terms.....	3
	Assumptions/Limitations/ Delimitations.....	3
	Significance of Study.....	4
II.	REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	6
	History and Mission of the NCAA.....	9
	The UNC-CH Scandal and Faculty Reform.....	10
	Stakeholder Theory.....	13
	Faculty-Led Reform Efforts.....	19
	Dr. Allen Sack’s Clashing Models for Faculty Reform.....	14
III.	METHODOLOGY.....	27
	Instrument Design and Data Collection.....	28
	Data Analysis.....	29
IV.	MANUSCRIPT.....	30
V.	References.....	59

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Demographic Information.....	54
2. Employee Satisfaction with Academics.....	55
3. Employee Satisfaction with Governance.....	56
4. Employee Satisfaction with Finance.....	57
5. Open-Ended Concerns.....	58

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

“Intercollegiate athletics on American college and university campuses have been a source of controversy and debate since their inception” (Thelin, 1996). Supporters of intercollegiate athletics have stated that “college sports are significant in defining the essence of the American college and university” (Toma, 1999, p.82), while dissenters believe that intercollegiate athletics do not fit the university’s core academic mission, engage in excessive commercially-driven behavior, and permit scandalous and unethical behavior on the part of coaches and student-athletes (Dunderstadt, 2003).

As intercollegiate athletics continue to evolve, there have been calls for reform from faculty on both the campus and national levels. Scholarly inquiries into faculty perceptions and satisfaction levels pertaining to intercollegiate athletics have provided valuable insight into the variation between campuses as study results have not been uniform (Putler & Wolfe, 1999). With differing beliefs, each faculty-led reform group has a different agenda and set of guiding principles. Even on individual campuses, divided groups of faculty make it difficult to prioritize proposals for reform and engage athletic departments and governing bodies in productive discussions.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH), a Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) institution and founding member of the Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC) continues to be involved in a major controversy and debate pertaining to issues within the athletic department (“UNC-CH,” 2012). A recent NCAA investigation found major violations; with

resultant sanctions surrounding the university's football program have led to changes in athletic department personnel, as well as feverish debate about the role and mission of intercollegiate athletics on the university's campus.

Congruent to the findings of Putler and Wolfe, faculty perceptions and satisfaction with aspects of intercollegiate athletics on this campus are not uniform, as there is notable discussion from both supporters and critics that demonstrate a lack of cohesion among faculty members (Putler & Wolfe, 1999). Now, with four current internal investigations of potential academic misconduct and fraud pertaining to student-athletes in the university's African and Afro-American Studies Department, the debate and dissension surrounding intercollegiate athletics does not seem to be going away anytime in the near future (Schoonmaker, 2012).

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine employee satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. This will extend the 2006 Knight Commission sponsored study, *Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics: A National Study of Faculty at NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) Institutions* to gather preliminary data pertaining specifically to employee satisfaction with academics, governance, and finance of the UNC-CH athletic department immediately following major NCAA violations and sanctions.

Research Questions

1. How satisfied are employees with the governance of intercollegiate athletics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill?
2. How satisfied are employees with the academic standards, performance, and integrity of intercollegiate athletics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill?
3. How satisfied are employees with the financing of intercollegiate athletics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill?
4. Do demographic factors (4a- 4g) influence employee satisfaction related to governance, academic standards, or financing of intercollegiate athletics at (UNC-CH)

- a. Gender
 - b. Race
 - c. Age
 - d. Academic Department
 - e. Fan Avidity
 - f. Percentage of Student-Athletes in Undergraduate Courses
 - g. Personal Experience as an athlete
5. What most concerns employees about intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH?
 6. What are employees satisfied with about intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH?

Assumptions

1. It is assumed that all respondents surveyed were truthful and accurate with their survey responses.
2. The completion of the survey is voluntary for all participants.

Delimitations

1. This study is only representative of a single, NCAA Division I institution.

Limitations

1. Survey respondents may not be a representative sample of all employees at UNC-CH.
2. Due to the voluntary nature of the survey and the resulting response rate, there may be a non-response bias.
3. Survey respondents may not have knowledge of the answers to some questions and may answer inaccurately.

Definitions of Terms

NCAA: The National Collegiate Athletic Association is a voluntary membership organization of colleges and universities that participate in intercollegiate athletics. The NCAA develops and maintains rules and regulations governing the athletic programs and activities of its member institutions.

Employee: For the purposes of this study, an employee at UNC-CH is defined as any person paid for wages or salary of any of the schools and colleges, academic departments, programs and curricula, offices and services, and research centers and laboratories.

Fan Avidity: Researchers define fan avidity as the level of interest, involvement, passion, and loyalty a fan exhibits to a particular sports entity (Desarbo, 2009).

Significance of the Study

This study will examine UNC-CH employee satisfaction with specific aspects of intercollegiate athletics governance, academic standards, and finance to examine the satisfaction of the entire faculty. After the NCAA investigation and subsequent violations, employees immediately expressed concerns over the increasing separation of the athletic and university mission (Hartness, 2012). Dr. Richard Southall, Director of the College Sport Research Institute at UNC-CH stated, “It is not simply up to the athletic department to make judgments about athletics, because as college sport become more corporatized and commercialized, there’s going to be conflicts” (Niss, 2012).

Coinciding with the investigation and sanctions, an informal group of faculty members met to discuss the future of athletics at UNC-CH. After a series of meetings, the group released a statement of guiding principles to the university’s Board of Trustees to ensure that the university is committed to both academic and athletic success. According to Professor Jay Smith, Distinguished Term Professor and Associated Chair of History, “We hope that this statement can provide a point of departure for public discussion and a foundation that the athletic program and the University as a whole can build on in the months and years ahead” (Niss, 2012).

Although 112 faculty members endorsed this statement of guiding principles, this may or may not reflect the sentiment of all of the faculty and staff at UNC-CH. Gathering information from a larger sample of employees would allow the UNC-CH athletic department and athletics governing bodies to engage dissatisfied faculty and staff in discussions about the pertinent issues within collegiate athletics, which are noted in this particular study. It is necessary to foster a

cooperative environment between the faculty and staff on the UNC-CH campus with the athletic department. Developing this relationship will not only help to better the entire university community, but will also help to ensure a positive, supportive experience for all UNC-CH student-athletes.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Three previous studies examining faculty perceptions and/or satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics within Division IA institutions provide a rich literary foundation for this study (Sherman, Weber & Tenago, 1988; Cockley & Roswal, 1994; Ott, 2011). These studies range in their survey instrument, methodology, and data analysis; however, each study draws significant differences in their conclusions based on their particular findings. These differences may be attributed to the changing nature of intercollegiate athletics over the periods of time, as the studies were completed in three different decades (1980's, 1990's, and 2000's).

The 1988 study investigated "Faculty Perceptions of Athletics at Division IA Universities." This study focused on the perceptions of faculty pertaining to the formation and execution of academic policies covering student-athletes. The study surveyed 18 out of the 104 institutions that were classified as Division IA institutions by the NCAA at this time. At each of the schools chosen, 75 faculty members were surveyed after being selected using each institution's faculty catalog. A simple random sample with replacement was used to determine the faculty members who would be surveyed. The survey yielded a response rate of 52%, with institutional response rates ranging from 29% to 71% (Sherman, Weber & Tenago, 1988).

The survey results and analysis showed that the general attitude of faculty towards athletics was mixed. The analysis showed that 74% of the faculty expressed that they have a voice in decisions about sports, but only 44% believed that the central administration provided good leadership in sports. In terms of the academic success of student-athletes, 29% of respondents felt that coaches encouraged student-athletes to succeed academically, while 65% responded that they did not feel as if student-athletes were as successful in the classroom as non-student-athletes. This result was surprising considering 55% of the respondents thought that

student-athletes received benefits to improve academic performance that other students did not receive (Sherman, Weber & Tenago, 1988).

Based on the analysis of the data, three main conclusions were drawn. First, faculty indicated a belief that athletics are an important, but not essential part of higher education. The faculty also voiced a belief that athletic personnel, not just the faculty, should assume the primary responsibility of assisting student-athletes in achieving academic success. Lastly, faculty did ultimately believe that their opinions counted in decisions about the relationship between academics and athletics, but not necessarily in other athletically related policy and decision-making (Sherman, Weber & Tenago, 1988).

In 1994, a study was conducted to compare “Faculty members perceived knowledge and satisfaction regarding NCAA athletic programs.” The stated purpose of this study was to “assess the control and administration of athletic programs as viewed by the faculty” (Cockley & Roswal, 1994). Satisfaction regarding perceived knowledge, academic environment, and administration control were investigated by both division affiliation (i.e., Division I, II, III) and whether or not the faculty were involved in an athletics governance role.

The sample consisted of full-time faculty members' responses from 48 institutions equally representing the three divisions as established by the NCAA. Forty faculty members and all current faculty athletic board members were selected at each institution to complete the survey instrument. There were 2,121 surveys distributed to the 48 NCAA member institutions randomly selected to be a part of the study, and there was a response rate of 38.2%.

The results and analysis of the questionnaire showed that the faculty of Division I institutions were significantly less satisfied with their respective athletic departments than the faculty of Division II institutions. Division III faculty were significantly more satisfied than Division I and Division II. Current faculty athletic board members from Division I and Division II were more satisfied with athletic programming at their institutions than the general faculty, while Division III comparisons illustrated a lack of significant difference. No significant

differences were found in satisfaction levels of current faculty athletic board members according to Division affiliation (Cockley & Roswal, 1994).

The satisfaction level of Division I faculty members was the lowest of all groups surveyed. This particular group was the only group to have items with 50% or greater dissatisfaction. Faculty reported dissatisfaction with eligibility requirements for all students to participate in student organizations, reflecting concern with appropriate courses, papers and tests (Cockley & Roswal, 1994). Although this study investigated faculty satisfaction levels from institutions in all three NCAA divisions, the Division I analysis is necessary in establishing a foundation for the discussion of this particular study.

This study will extend the research and use aspects of the survey instrument from the 2006 Knight Commission sponsored study, "Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics: A National Study of Faculty at NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision Institutions." The 2006 study examined faculty perceptions and satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics on their campus. The study looked at how perceptions and satisfaction may vary based on individual attributes, as well as the institution's athletic program and general campus attributes.

The survey was organized around governance, finance, and academic questions pertaining to intercollegiate athletics. The survey was distributed to a sample of faculty at 23 schools to represent the 119 FBS colleges and universities in 2007. With 3,005 faculty responding, the response rate of this survey was 22%. After adjusting the sample to fit the specific needs of this particular instrument and data analysis, the responses from 2,071 faculty members were used for discussion and analysis.

This study revealed that a large number of faculty members were most pleased with aspects of academics, as the respondents indicated that they had a positive experience in working with student-athletes, and believed student-athletes demonstrated academic integrity in their studies. Another significant finding was the faculty who were involved in athletics-related governance at their particular institution had much higher satisfaction with all aspects of

intercollegiate athletics. Lastly, faculty members were displeased with the range of faculty perspectives considered by central administrators in developing policy for intercollegiate athletics. The faculty was disappointed with the extent to which the entire faculty had input in decisions pertaining to athletics (Ott, 2011).

Overall, these three studies provide unique discussion and analysis pertaining to faculty perceptions and satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics because of the timing of their implementation. This study will extend the literature into the current decade in exploration of similar issues in an effort to determine whether there are similar findings from a large representation at a single university following an NCAA infraction case or whether the changing nature of intercollegiate athletics will yield far different results and findings than any of the three previous studies.

History and Mission of the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA)

The National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) was established in 1906 with the purpose of protecting college athletes from “exploitive and dangerous practices” (“History of the,” 2010). Originally named the Intercollegiate Athletic Association of the United States (IAAUS), the group was formed when President Theodore Roosevelt summoned university leaders to the White House to encourage reform after serious injuries and multiple deaths occurred as a result of dangerous practices and limited regulations (Smith, 2011). The IAAUS was renamed the National Collegiate Athletic Association and officially constituted on March 31, 1906 (“History of the,” 2010).

With a growing number of faculty-led reform groups, President Mark Emmert and the NCAA have had to respond to the various criticisms of the volunteer membership organization, and have done so by reiterating the stated mission and purpose of the student-centered organization (“Office of the,” 2010). The stated mission of the NCAA is “to be an integral part of higher education and to focus on the development of our student-athletes” (“Office of the,” 2010). Many reform groups suggest that student-athletes are no longer amateurs, as intercollegiate

athletics moves towards a professional model due to rampant commercialization. NCAA President Mark Emmert has responded to these assertions by stating, “We have to make sure people know what we stand for and what we care about. Yes, we want to maximize our media contracts, but we have to talk about why. What do we do with those resources? How does it enhance students’ lives? How does it help shape the championships across all our sports” (“Office of the,” 2010)? This criticism does not simply face the NCAA as an organization, but member institutions now face opposition from faculty members on their own campuses surrounding issues within collegiate athletics.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Scandal and Faculty Reform

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) is not only well known as the first public university in the country and as a premier scholarly institution with cutting edge academic research, public service, and teaching, but also as an institution with high athletic prestige. As the “front- porch” of the university (Longman, 2009), unparalleled athletic success has made UNC-CH not only a domestic, but global brand. After the 2009 Men’s basketball National Championship season, Forbes estimated the university made over \$25.9 million in merchandise sales (Minnik, 2009). The UNC-CH brand will continue to remain prominent, as the institution signed a ten- year contract with Nike in 2008 valued at \$37.7 million to make Nike the exclusive supplier of Tar Heel products (“UNC, Nike sign,” 2009). Former UNC-CH Chancellor Michael Hooker stated, "Carolina has the good fortune of being one of a handful of universities whose logo and trademarks are internationally recognized symbols” (“Tar Heel memorabilia”).

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH), a founding member institution of the Atlantic Coast Conference (ACC), currently sponsors 28 varsity sports and is noted for having a “broad-based” athletic program (“UNC-CH,” 2012). Although the university does financially support 28 varsity sports, the prominence of the athletic program can be attributed to the national success of both Men’s Basketball and Women’s Soccer and its globally recognizable alumni. Men’s basketball not only has five National Collegiate Athletic Association

(NCAA) National Championships, but has a plethora of famous alumni including global superstar Michael Jordan (“Championship history,” 2012). Women’s soccer has an NCAA record 21 National Championships, and an alumni base including Mia Hamm and other internationally recognizable stars (Litterer, 2011). With global stars as alumni and multiple national championships, UNC-CH is an athletic brand associated with on-field success and star- power.

The achievements of the athletic department have also been supported with a reputation of strong academic performance from the athletes. According to the NCAA report for the 2010-2011 season, UNC-CH had six sports with a perfect Academic Progress Rate (APR) score of 1000. The APR is a multi-year score that measures a team’s academic success by tracking the progress of each athlete on scholarship. The APR accounts for eligibility, retention, and graduation of athletes (Thompson, 2011).

Fifty years removed from a major NCAA violation, the NCAA investigated the UNC-CH football program for potentially major violations. The football “scandal” included a lengthy investigation into current and former players and a former assistant coach’s relationships with agents. The NCAA’s investigation also examined academic misconduct and the athlete’s relationship with a former tutor and academic advisor. Based on the allegations, the institution self-imposed penalties, including vacating wins from the 2008-2009 seasons, as well as placing the football program on two-years of probation (Tysiac, 2011).

The NCAA Committee on Infractions released additional penalties after a 16-month investigation which placed UNC-CH on probation for three years, removed 15 football scholarships over the same three-year period, fined the institution \$50,000, and banned the football team from participating in post-season play for the 2012-2013 season. The university did not appeal the NCAA Committee on Infraction’s penalties (Curtis, 2012).

Both on-campus and editorial discussions have surfaced due to the negative tone pertaining to big-time college sports, specifically the issues on the UNC-CH campus. Taylor Branch, a UNC-CH alumnus and Pulitzer Prize-winning journalist and historian, visited the

UNC-CH campus for a discussion of what must change in big-time intercollegiate athletics. Mr. Branch published “The Shame of College Sports” in *The Atlantic Magazine*, which author Frank Deford has said is “the most important article ever written about college sports” (“Collegiate sports topic,” 2012). *New York Times* Op-Ed columnist Joe Nocera also came to the campus to continue the conversation on the issues in collegiate sports, specifically discussing the exploitation of the student-athlete and lack of due process provided by the NCAA. Nocera has gained much attention for a series of hard-hitting columns examining the procedures and policies of the NCAA. The NCAA, he has argued, “ignores due-process rights, recklessly destroys reputations and playing careers, contradicts its own policies, and mainly looks out for itself” (“Big-time sports,” 2012). Both on-campus conversations garnered much debate and feverish discussion and have continued the dialogue pertaining to the negative aspects of intercollegiate athletics.

The NCAA investigation and subsequent penalties galvanized UNC-CH employee efforts to engage the school’s athletes more in classes and on campus. The university’s employees immediately expressed concerns over the increasing separation of the athletic and university mission (Hartness, 2012). Dr. Richard Southall, Director of the College Sport Research Institute at UNC-CH stated, “It is not simply up to the athletic department to make judgments about athletics, because as college sport become more corporatized and commercialized, there’s going to be conflicts” (Niss, 2012).

Coinciding with the investigation and sanctions, an informal group of faculty members met to discuss the future of athletics at UNC-CH. After a series of meetings, the group released a statement of guiding principles to the university’s Board of Trustees to ensure that the university is committed to both academic and athletic success. According to Professor Jay Smith, Distinguished Term Professor and Associated Chair of History, “We hope that this statement can provide a point of departure for public discussion and a foundation that the athletic program and the University as a whole can build on in the months and years ahead” (Niss, 2012). By February

12, 2012, this statement of guiding principles was endorsed by 112 faculty members throughout the university's campus (Carter, 2012).

The statement describes three principles that the institution should follow in the pursuit of both athletic and academic success. The principles discussed, included institutional openness, educational responsibility, and mission consistency ("A statement of", 2012). By adhering to these three principles, the faculty group hopes the university can work towards a stronger sense of unity between the athletic department, faculty, and university at large in order to better the educational experiences and opportunities for all athletes (Carter, 2012).

Coinciding with the formation of the letter and seemingly palpable faculty unrest related to athletic administration within the academy, UNC has continued to sponsor various speakers and panels to engage the entire university community in discussions pertaining to big-time college sports within the university. The authors of the statement have said "they want the large philosophical and structural issues surrounding college athletics to be on the front burner for months or years" (Niss, 2012).

Overall, the UNC-CH football program's scandal, investigation, and sanctions have created unrest among many of the faculty surrounding the athletic administration and its operation on campus. As an institution known for both on and off-the-field success, select UNC-CH faculty members have become increasingly involved in reform pertaining to big-time collegiate sports and provide a unique sample to investigate based on the relevancy of the issues at hand.

Stakeholder Theory

Employee discussion and efforts for reform of intercollegiate athletics must be addressed; the employee is an essential stakeholder of the university and its infrastructure. The infrastructure on a university campus includes all organizational departments. It does not simply include basic academic departments, but offices such as Accounting Services or Residential life are also essential stakeholders within the university. An institution's faculty members are

stakeholders because of their “loyal interest to the firm” (Fassin, 2008). Stakeholder theory is utilized to answer the question “of to whom businesses or organizations have a responsibility” (Fassin, 2008).

In terms of a university, the athletic department has multiple stakeholders, including all employees on campus because of their interest in the success of their respective departments on campus. University employees are internal constituents, as they “have a real stake in the company” (Fassin, 2008). Internal constituents play an integral role in an athletic department because they are “affected by the achievement of an organization’s objectives” (Fassin, 2008). For instance, the sanctions imposed by the NCAA based on football improprieties negatively affect the faculty, as internal constituents remain bound by the organization’s achievements and failures. This means that the university has a responsibility to its employees because they are stakeholders in the institution as a whole and must address the issues. Their concerns are valid because of their stake in the success of campus organizations.

Theoretical Framework

In order to guide the examination of employee satisfaction of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH, this study was framed utilizing three philosophical viewpoints, which describe generally accepted staff and faculty issues and assumptions that divide institutional reformers and reform groups within Division I institutions across the country. The three reform groups, as constructed by Allen Sack, include intellectual elitists, academic capitalists, and athletes’ rights advocates (Sack, 2009).

The basis of differentiation between the philosophies stems from assumptions regarding three main issues: the relationship of commercialism to academic values, the legal status of athletic scholarships, and the mission of higher education. The faculty/staff groups that ascribe to these particular philosophies generally base their assumptions and measures for reform on these particular issues (Sack, 2009). These models are necessary in understanding the framework of this study because each group’s guiding principles create a division among faculty and staff that

lead towards campus dissension as related to intercollegiate athletics. By examining the various models that have been established, one can see that the UNC-CH campus has been engaged in feverish debate because of the inconsistencies in employee beliefs pertaining to intercollegiate athletics. These models provide a brief outline as to the main dividing issues among faculty members at Division I BCS institutions.

Intellectual Elitism.

The intellectual elitist model maintains that highly commercialized athletics have a negative effect on our current higher education system. Many intellectual elitists believe that an institution of higher education should simply consist of scholars and students that are wholly protected from any forms of commercialism that have a negative effect on the mission of higher education (Gerdy, 2006).

To further enhance the rationale and support for this academic sanctity argument, academic elitists argue, the extravagant resources that are used in the never-ending arms race of intercollegiate athletics could be used for academic purposes. This would include updating libraries, laboratories, etc. As noted in a 2008 survey distributed and analyzed by *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, “Over half of the nation’s 73 biggest athletic programs have more than doubled their spending in academic support for athletes during the past ten years. On the average, institutions spent more than \$1 million in academic support” (Wolverton, 2008). Ultimately, faculty members at Division I NCAA member institutions deem the mission of higher education to be rooted in creating well-educated citizens, and as such, educational resources should be spent on supporting this mission rather than lavish athletically related facilities (Gerdy, 2006).

The role of athletics within the academy, as related to intellectual elitism, is founded on the idea that competitive athletics is a means of enhancing the education of the athletes (Gerdy, 2006b). The on-field competition, not rapid commercialization and growing athletic department budgets, will provide the athletes with the most beneficial experience (Dowling, 2007).

In terms of athletic scholarships, these faculty members believe that scholarships should be given based on financial need or academically related merit and should be controlled by the university and not the coaches of the athletes' particular sport. Having the coaches involved in the scholarship process, allows the coaches to set the academic priorities for the athletes (Sack & Staurowsky, 1998). This may allow for coaches to encourage athletes to choose classes and majors that may simply keep the student eligible for competition, rather than enhancing their educational experience.

Commercialism and the pressure to field a winning program and produce higher revenue streams, enables institutions to attract and admit students whose sole focus is on the athletic and not academic experience. Allowing athletes with lower academic credentials than the rest of the student body may undermine the integrity of an institution of higher education (Dowling, 2007).

Academic Capitalism.

The conceptual model of academic capitalism can be directly related to the increasing commercialization of intercollegiate athletics in higher education. Academic capitalism focuses on the "bottom line." In congruence with this bottom-line approach of many universities, jock-capitalist athletic departments utilize similar marketing practices to exploit the same revenue streams as professional leagues such as the National Basketball Association (NBA) and the National Football League (NFL). Many argue that this focus on the "bottom line" is a professionalized model that has no relationship to the mission of higher education and there is no clear demarcation between the commercialization in professional and collegiate sports (Southall & Nagel, 2009).

The late president of the NCAA, Dr. Myles Brand, supported the academic capitalism model and believed that the athletic department is a core aspect of the academy. Dr. Brand stated, "There are ...clear distinctions between the collegiate and professional models of athletics. Professional sports' sole purposes are to entertain the public and make a profit for team owners. The purpose of the collegiate model is to enhance the educational development of athletes"

(Brand, 2006a). According to Dr. Brand, commercialism is appropriate when in congruence with the stated values, mission, and goals of higher education (Brand, 2006a).

There is an educational benefit of participating in collegiate sports, and revenue production helps to provide many students with the opportunity to participate in and enhance the entire college experience. Commercialism may be necessary in providing the finest educational experience for the athletes. Like athletics, a theatre or music department may host a nationally televised or recognized play or concert, with multiple sponsors, advertisements, and other revenue necessary streams. Similar to athletic departments, the revenue from a theatrical or musical production is necessary and worthwhile if it is being used as a source of funding for scholarships and department infrastructure (Brand, 2006d).

Like Dr. Brand, other academic capitalists believe that the mission of higher education should also be to emphasize career preparation, as well as intellectual studies. This means that extra-curricular activities have as much value as the in-class studies (Sack, 2008). Many extracurricular activities require substantial operating costs; meaning revenue generation is necessary to provide such opportunities (Brand, 2006c). Career preparation consists of students benefiting from real-life lessons in leadership, including hard work, self-discipline, teamwork, self-sacrifice, and striving for excellence all of which are fundamental education benefits to participation in intercollegiate athletics. (Hofstadter, 1963).

The conceptual theory of academic capitalism as related to intercollegiate athletics, stresses the educational value of an athletic scholarship. Dr. Brand, one of the main proponents and spokespeople for academic capitalism, understands that other students with “special talents” are admitted to institutions of higher education, as would an exceptional athlete. Like other students, those who are admitted with exceptional talents also are given particular advantages, including academic support and eligibility standards (Brand, 2006d).

Pertaining to the relationship of commercialism to academic values, academic capitalists believe that all athletes are amateurs. This means that athletes are not employees of the

institution, but rather students receiving an opportunity to participate in meaningful extracurricular activities. Commercialism does not hurt academic value, as long as the commercialism does not prevent a meaningful educational experience for all athletes.

Athletes' Rights.

The last subset of faculty reform as discussed by Dr. Sack includes athlete's rights advocates. Those advocating for the student-athlete understand that collegiate sport is "commercial entertainment" and that will most likely not change in the near future. However, these faculty members believe the NCAA supports a free market for every party, but the athletes. Commercialism has become "deeply embedded" in collegiate athletics, however, it gives no opportunity for the athletes to be involved in such commercialism and deprives the athletes of rights that other stakeholders have (Sack & Staurowsky, 1998).

Athlete's rights advocates believe that amateurism is simply a myth and that athletes are both university employees and students. As employees at the institution, athletes would be eligible for workers' compensation and receive a share of the revenues in which they help to produce (McCormick & McCormick, 2006).

Athletic scholarships also undermine the academic values that should be the priority for the athletes. Similar to intellectual elitism, it is viewed that when coaches control the financial aid, they will set the academic priorities for the athletes, and simply ensure that their athletes remain academically eligible for athletic participation (Sack & Staurowsky, 1998).

In terms of the mission of higher education, those associated with athlete's rights believe that athletes deserve the same educational opportunities as all other students. However, if these athletes are working like employees, then they are clearly deprived of all of the educational and intellectual opportunities that an institution offers. The mission of higher education is not being fulfilled if the student-athlete is both an employee and a student at the same time (Sack, 2008).

The three groups of faculty reformers vary in their assumptions towards specific issues, which define their efforts for reform in Division I intercollegiate athletics. To fully understand

the differences between intellectual elitists, academic capitalists, and advocates for athletes' rights, it is necessary to examine the assumptions which each group has towards the relationship of commercialism to academic values, the educational impact and legal status of athletic scholarships, and the mission of higher education. These assumptions towards these concerns have given each group defining principles to guide their current attempts for major reform (Sack, 2009).

Faculty-Led Reform Efforts

In the early 1990's, "the emphasis on intercollegiate athletic reform was driven by university Presidents" ("The role of the faculty," n.d., para. 1), however, more recently, faculty have become involved in reform and policy formulation on both the campus and national level. Prominent national faculty-led reform groups include the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), the Drake Group, and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) (Ridpath, 2008).

In addition to the most prominent reform groups led by faculty, local faculty reform groups are increasing in number as faculty push for changes on their campuses (Ridpath, 2008). One notable example includes a 2009 group at the University of California at Berkley, where eight faculty members proposed a resolution to the Academic Senate in 2009 to end all university funding for intercollegiate athletics. The resolution was passed and the Academic Senate decided that it would be best for the athletic department to "pay its own way" (Bergman, 2009).

Even as the issues in collegiate athletics have seemed to become more publicized in recent years, historically, there have been other faculty-led reform initiatives on campuses. In January 1993, Professor William Dowling of Rutgers University formed a group of 1,000 alumni, students, and faculty, named the "Rutgers 1000," to have Rutgers removed from the Big East Conference. Rutgers joined the Big East in 1991 and Professor Dowling felt that the institution had decided to sacrifice their academic integrity for athletic success when the institution changed conferences. The Rutgers 1000 continue their reform efforts today and are still working towards

integrating athletics into the university, rather than having the athletic department as a separate commercial entity, which undermines the mission of the university (Anthes, 2010).

Not only have faculty reform groups formed due to local campus issues, but there are also national groups, which also push a strict reform agenda. The Knight Commission, the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), the Drake Group, and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) are prominent reform groups led by faculty members from various institutions across the country. Each group has their own specific reform proposals and initiatives in which they feel can improve the current state of intercollegiate athletics.

Understanding these faculty-led reform efforts is necessary to evaluate the current situation on the UNC-CH campus. The reform groups have not only examined and published materials related to UNC-CH improprieties, but many of the faculty members on the campus are active members in these vocal reform groups, which look towards progressive methods of reform. To understand the current situation on the UNC-CH campus, it is necessary to evaluate the method and solutions in which faculty are utilizing for reform.

The Knight Commission.

The Johns S. and James L. Knight Foundation created the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics in 1989 in response to multiple highly visible scandals within Division I collegiate athletics. The initial goal of the foundation was “to recommend a reform agenda that emphasized academic values in an arena where commercialization of college sports often overshadowed the underlying goals of higher education” (“About Knight Commission,” n.d., para. 1). The primary purpose of the commission is to promote transparency for athletic departments to ensure integrity in both financial and academic policies (“About Knight Commission,” n.d., para. 3).

In 1991, the Knight Commission published, “Keeping Faith with the Student-Athlete: A New Model for Intercollegiate Athletics,” which promoted a “one plus three model.” The model

pushed for Presidential control, which would lead to academic and fiscal integrity to be verified with an extensive certification process (“A call to action,” 2003).

Although the Knight Commission’s leadership group does not consist of any current faculty members from a Division I institution, the reform group has worked extensively with faculty from across the country to work towards their stated mission and balance both academics and athletics (“About Knight Commission,” n.d., para. 2).

To examine current faculty perceptions and satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics, The Knight Commission authorized a national survey of faculty members at NCAA Division I FBS Universities in 2006. The survey gathered data pertaining to faculty perceptions and concerns with intercollegiate athletics and asked whether or not faculty would consider joining campus-based initiatives to discuss and examine the issues.

For the purposes of this study, employee and faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill will be measured, discussed, and examined utilizing a similar purpose, research questions, survey instrument, and statistical procedures from the Knight Commission sponsored-study, “Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics: A National Study of Faculty at NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision Institutions.”

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA).

The Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA) was formed in 2002 after Pac Ten and Big Ten Senate Presidents felt that there needed to be “cohesion among all campus faculty governance committees to create a united voice in intercollegiate athletic reform efforts” (“The coalition,” 2003). There are currently 57 faculty senates from Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) institutions that have joined the coalition (“The coalition,” 2003).

In March 2003, COIA established a charter to frame their mission and initiatives. The stated purpose of the organization is to “articulate a broad national faculty voice in support of reform efforts, to contribute ideas towards a successful long-term strategy for reform, and to work

with other groups committed to ensuring that athletics enhances rather than undermines the academic mission” (“Framing the Future,” 2003). COIA is led by a Steering Committee, with at least one and no more than three representatives from each of the major BCS conferences, who are responsible for drafting a vision of long-term reform initiatives (“Framing the Future,” 2003). This steering committee has established five areas in need of reform within intercollegiate athletics including academics, athlete welfare, finances and scale, commercialization, and governance.

COIA is committed to working with other groups to discuss and implement change. In the past, COIA has worked extensively with the NCAA, American Association of University Professors (AAUP), and Knight Commission to support and fund research that investigates key issues that are a part of the established charter. For example, in 2007, COIA presented 29 proposals to better integrate intercollegiate athletics in the educational mission of the institutions. This initiative was closely aligned with the issues addressed by the NCAA Presidential Task Force on the Future of Division I Intercollegiate Athletics in 2006. COIA endorsed this report and has continued to work closely with the NCAA on specific non-legislative recommendations (“The coalition,” 2003).

The Drake Group.

The Drake Group began in the early 1990’s when Professor Jon Ericson, of Drake University, organized a group of faculty pushing for athletic reform from institutions across the country. Mr. Ericson became involved in faculty reform because he felt that Drake University had academic majors, which focused solely on maintaining athlete’s eligibility. Mr. Ericson published a report titled “While the Faculty Sleep” to expose the faculty and administration at Drake University for their involvement in this academic dishonesty.

Mr. Ericson officially called for a conference, “Corruption in College Sports: The Way Out,” after an incident at the University of Minnesota revealed that tutors would write papers and complete take-home exams for the athletes. The conference participants, mainly tenured faculty,

decided to name themselves the National Association for College Athletic Reform (NAFCAR) after their first meeting. The group then changed their name to the Drake Group based on the location of the conference and because of the confusing acronym used to describe their group.

Although the first meeting consisted of faculty with varying ideas for reform and no consistent proposals, the group ultimately concluded “faculty representatives and faculty themselves needed to have substantially more power and authority” (“The history of,” n.d., para. 1). After multiple meetings and discussions for reform, the group decided to picket outside of the 2004 NCAA Final Four basketball tournament. After the picketing, Dr. Myles Brand described the Drake Group as a group of “self-appointed radical reformers and incorrigible cynics...consisting of a small number of faculty members with an eye for publicity” (Smith, 2011).

The stated mission of the Drake Group is “to help faculty and staff defend academic integrity in the face of the burgeoning college sport industry. The Drake Group's national network of college faculty lobby aggressively for proposals that ensure quality education for college athletes, support faculty whose job security is threatened for defending academic standards, and disseminates information on current issues and controversies in sport and higher education” (“The Drake Group,” n.d., para. 1). Currently, the Drake Group consists of faculty members from universities across the country in varying divisions and conferences within the NCAA and looks for Faculty Senate groups and other campus governing bodies to work with the athletic department to decrease the “widening gap” between athletics and academics.

This faculty-led reform group has three stated proposals to improve the “academic integrity of college campuses and to return control of the classroom back to the faculty” (“The history of,” n.d., para 1). The three-prong approach includes ensuring academic transparency, academic priority, and academic-based participation. Within each of these three proposals, there are specific steps, which the Drake Group has established, to work towards their stated mission.

The first phase, to provide academic transparency, involves a variety of measures to ensure that the university, as well as the trustees, administrators, and faculty are held accountable for athletics related issues. The Drake Group proposes that there be public transparency in an athlete's academic major, academic advisor, courses listed by academic major, general education requirements, electives, courses, grade point average (GPA), and course instructors. None of this would involve revealing the name of any of the athletes.

The second phase of reform would work towards ensuring that the priority for each athlete is academics, and not athletics related endeavors. Within this proposal, there are three distinct measures for reform. This would require athletes to maintain a 2.0 cumulative GPA each semester to maintain athletic eligibility. Also, academic advising, counseling, and support services for athletes would no longer be under the control of the athletic department, but rather have the same oversight that these services have for all students. Lastly, to work towards academic priority, the Drake Group proposes that there are distinct university policies, which would not allow for athletic competition or practices to conflict with any scheduled classes.

The last phase of the Drake Group's priorities for reform includes establishing academic-based participation. Within this phase, one-year renewable scholarships would be replaced with financially based awards or scholarships that are guaranteed until graduation with a five-year maximum. Also, this phase would require that all athletes spend one year in residency before being eligible for competition. This would reinstitute freshman ineligibility for all athletes, including those who transfer ("The Drake Group," 2012).

American Association of University Professors (AAUP).

The AAUP was founded after Professor Edward Ross was fired from Stanford University after speaking out about policies pertaining to immigrant labor and railroad monopolies ("History of the AAUP," n.d., para. 1). Philosopher Arthur Lovejoy of Johns Hopkins University heard of the incident and organized a meeting in 1915 to create an organization that deals with academic

freedom and prevalent issues for university faculty members. The AAUP describes itself as “the voice of the profession” (“History of the AAUP,” n.d., para. 4).

The stated mission of the AAUP is “to advance academic freedom and shared governance, to define fundamental professional values and standards for higher education, and to ensure higher education's contribution to the common good” (“AAUP: Mission,” 2010). The AAUP provides advice and assistance to over 1,000 faculty members per year from across the country about significant issues in higher education. The AAUP also works with Congress and legislative officials to provide “effective higher education legislation to promote the profession and purposes of higher education” (“AAUP: Mission,” 2010). Some of the more recent issues that the AAUP has focused on include work and family policies, graduate student education, distance education, and intellectual property (“AAUP: Mission,” 2010).

The AAUP has stated, “College athletics in this country are a continuing crisis” (“The role of the faculty,” n.d., para. 1). Although the organization has heavily criticized the role of college athletics within the academy, the AAUP has worked in congruence with the NCAA. For example, in 2003, the AAUP, NCAA, COIA held a conference to “explore the challenges of collaboration” (Smith, 2011). The conference was meant to explore teamwork and examine methods of creating a stronger relationship between faculty and the NCAA (Smith, 2011).

In 1989, the AAUP prepared a report “The Role of Faculty in the Governance of College Athletics” by a special committee on athletics. This special report contains specific proposals to improve intercollegiate athletics, as well as other mechanisms for faculty involvement, which were approved by the Association’s Committee on College and University Government.

As it pertains to intercollegiate athletics, the AAUP has general principles to define faculty responsibility in the governance of intercollegiate athletics. These general principles were established in a 1966 “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities.” Although this

statement was published in 1966, the AAUP has continued to publish and support literature, which examines and suggests improvement for faculty involvement of intercollegiate athletics.

The “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities” has four main principles. The first principle stresses full disclosure of information about the institution’s athletic program. Like many other faculty reform groups, the AAUP wants transparency in the athletic department’s finances, as well as the information pertaining to the education of each individual athlete. This openness would allow for strict scrutiny from the university community.

Another stated principle emphasizes the faculty’s responsibility in educating each athlete. Faculty members are responsible for ensuring that each athlete has the same educational opportunities as the rest of the student body. Each faculty member must assist the athlete in balancing the commitments for athletic competition with their educational responsibilities.

The AAUP’s original guidelines pushed for greater faculty involvement in the policy-making aspects of the athletic department. For example, the AAUP feels that if an institution is considering moving conferences or divisions, then they should be involved in this decision making process. Each institution’s faculty must also be involved in the allocation of resources, including financial planning and long-term development.

Lastly, the “Statement of Government of Colleges and Universities” looks to establish a relationship between the faculty and outside governing bodies. Outside governing bodies would include the NCAA and athletic conferences. These outside governing bodies are responsible for establishing many internal university policies because of conference or division regulations. The principles states, “Each institution should develop mechanisms that recognize the role of the chief executive officer in speaking for the institution, but which also afford an opportunity for faculty participation in the formulation of the institution’s response” (“Statement on,” 1990). The AAUP stresses more interaction between the faculty, President/ Chancellor, and Athletic Director when working with outside governing bodies (“Statement on,” 1990).

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Many of the issues pertaining to intercollegiate athletics on this campus are seen across Division I institutions and feverish faculty discussion is not limited to UNC-CH. After UNC-CH's first major violation in 50 years, the campus became a hotbed for debate, with the creation of an informal faculty reform group and on-campus discussions from prominent speakers including Joe Nocera and Taylor Branch ("Collegiate Sports Topic," 2012). Although there are vocal proponents and opponents to intercollegiate athletics, it is necessary to gain a representative sample because the majority of faculty members have not been vocal in expressing their opinions of intercollegiate athletics. Dr. Allen Sack presented his model for the differing views on faculty reform and the characteristics of each reform group based on their opinions towards major issues within collegiate athletics (Sack, 2009). This model to group faculty demonstrates the growing chasm between faculty and athletic departments.

The purpose of this study is to examine faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH. This will extend the 2006 Knight Commission sponsored study, Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics: A National Study of Faculty at NCAA Division I Football Bowl Subdivision (FBS) Institutions to gather preliminary data pertaining specifically to faculty satisfaction with academics, governance, and finance of the UNC-CH athletic department immediately following major NCAA violations and sanctions.

The population of interest was faculty and employee members at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) to determine their satisfaction and concerns pertaining to the

governance, academic standards, and finance of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH following a major NCAA investigation and sanctions.

Instrument Design and Data Collection

The development of the Faculty Survey utilized in this study progressed through three phases. Discussions about the content commenced with a meeting of a faculty advisory committee convened by the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics in September of 2006. Prominent themes that evolved during this meeting were then discussed in interviews with faculty and members of the provost's office on five campuses that differed in size, location and control throughout November of 2006- February of 2007. A questionnaire was drafted based on previous research, the advisory committee discussion, the interviews, and documents from groups such as the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), and the NCAA. The draft questionnaire was piloted with project advisors from the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics and a group of faculty from the University of Michigan from January of 2007 to April of 2007 (Ott, 2011).

The Faculty instrument was adapted, with permission from the authors, to fit particular characteristics of the athletic department and university as a whole to better survey all employees at UNC-CH. Modifications were reviewed by a panel of experts in an effort to maximize content validity. This panel included two professors, a Senior Staff member in the UNC-CH athletic department, the initial drafter of the Knight Commission Study, and a survey methodology expert from The Howard W. Odum Institute for Social Science.

The Faculty Survey is organized around three theoretically distinct yet interrelated aspects of intercollegiate athletics and general campus climate, specifically: governance, finance and academics. *Governance items* assess faculty involvement in, satisfaction with general campus decision-making bodies such as faculty senates and with athletics-specific governance roles and committees, such as FARs and campus athletic advisory committees. Faculty views of campus leadership, including the president and athletics administrators, are also examined. *Finance items* focus on faculty satisfaction with campus priorities that guide budgetary decisions for the campus generally and intercollegiate athletics specifically,

and commercial intercollegiate activities. *Academics* items inquire about admissions and advising policies and practices as well as students' academic performance and faculty colleagues' attitudes toward student-athletes. In all cases, faculty members were advised to frame their responses based upon their campus, their classes, and their local colleagues (Ott, 2011).

The survey instrument includes both open-ended and Likert-type questions distributed across three sections:

- I. Demographic questions inquire about the respondents' gender, race, age, highest degree earned, current academic ranks, administrative responsibilities, tenure status, field of teaching, regular season basketball, football, and Olympic sport attendance, fan avidity, athletics governance role, interaction with student-athletes, sources of information about intercollegiate athletics, and their personal experiences as a student-athlete.
- II. Satisfaction items (Likert-type questions) have respondents indicate their satisfaction with student, administrator and faculty behavior related to governance, academics, and finance.
- III. Major Concerns are identified by means of an open-ended item at the end of each section that asks faculty to indicate what most concerns them about intercollegiate athletics on their campus, specific to governance, academic standards, and finance.

Data Analysis

After closing the survey, all data was entered into Statistical Product and Service Solutions (SPSS) for statistical analysis. Specific methodology and statistical testing will be discussed in the results section.

CHAPTER IV

Introduction

There has been debate and controversy surrounding the role of intercollegiate athletics on the college and university campus since their inception (Thelin, 1996). Supporters of intercollegiate athletics have stated that “college sports are significant in defining the essence of the American college and university” (Toma, 1999, p. 82), while dissenters believe that intercollegiate athletics do not fit the university’s core academic mission, engage in excessive commercially-driven behavior, and permit scandalous and unethical behavior on the part of coaches and student-athletes (Duderstadt, 2003).

Scholarly inquiries into faculty perceptions and satisfaction levels pertaining to intercollegiate athletics have provided valuable insight into the variation between campuses as study results have not been uniform (Putler & Wolfe, 1999). With differing beliefs, faculty-led reform groups have also reflected differing agendas and guiding principles. Even on individual campuses, divided groups of faculty make it difficult to prioritize proposals for reform and engage athletic departments and governing bodies in productive discussions.

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) was involved in a major controversy and debate pertaining to issues within the athletic department (“UNC-CH,” 2012). A major National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) investigation and sanctions for violations involving the football program, as well as an internal investigation into the university’s African and Afro-American Studies Department led to changes in athletic department personnel, as well as feverish debate about the role and mission of intercollegiate athletics on the university’s campus.

The purpose of this study is to gather preliminary data to examine the concerns UNC-CH employees have with academics (standards, performance, and integrity), governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics. This study’s data can be utilized to bridge the widening gap between

intercollegiate athletics and the academy. To follow is an overview of intercollegiate athletic reform efforts at UNC-CH, as well as other national intercollegiate athletic reform efforts. Previous research into faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics will then be reviewed to provide a foundation for the survey methodology and instrument of this study. Lastly, Sack's "Clashing Models of Commercial Sport in Higher Education" will be utilized as a lens through which the philosophical differences between faculty/staff pertaining to the issues of intercollegiate athletic academics (standards, performance, and integrity), governance, and finance can be more fully understood.

Review of Related Literature

Intercollegiate Athletics Reform Efforts at UNC-CH

An increasing number of faculty-led reform groups have questioned the mission of the NCAA due to increased commercialization and rampant spending. President Mark Emmert has reaffirmed the mission of the NCAA is "to be an integral part of higher education and to focus on the development of our student-athletes" ("Office of the," 2010, para. 4). Disapproval of the mission of intercollegiate athletics is now a localized issue at UNC-CH due to high-profile investigations and subsequent penalties that brought into question the purpose and role of intercollegiate athletics on campus.

Fifty years removed from a major NCAA violation, the UNC-CH football program was investigated for potential major violations. The issues with the football program included a relationship between players, a former assistant coach, and agents. The NCAA's investigation also examined academic misconduct and athlete relationships with a former tutor and academic advisor. After investigation, the institution self-imposed penalties, including vacating wins from the 2008-2009 seasons, as well as placing the football program on two-years of probation. The NCAA Committee on Infractions then released additional penalties which placed UNC-CH on probation for three years, removed 15 football scholarships over the same three-year period, fined the institution \$50,000, and banned the football team from participating in post-season play for the 2012-2013 season (Tysiac, 2011; Curtis, 2012).

Following the NCAA's investigation into the football program, there was an investigation into potential academic fraud in the African and Afro-American Studies Department at UNC-CH. Former North Carolina Governor Jim Martin led a three month-investigation, which found that the issue was not an "athletic, but academic scandal" (Pickeral, 2012, para. 3). The investigation showed that no misconduct occurred outside of the university's African and Afro-American Studies Department, and that the academic fraud involved both student-athletes and non-student-athletes. The NCAA informed UNC-CH that no rules were broken and there would not be further penalties (Pickeral, 2012).

The investigations galvanized UNC-CH employee efforts to engage in critical discussion about the role of athletics in higher education. The university's faculty/staff expressed concerns over the increasing separation of the athletic and university missions (Hartness, 2012). Dr. Richard Southall, Director of the College Sport Research Institute at UNC-CH stated, "It is not simply up to the athletic department to make judgments about athletics, because as college sport become more corporatized and commercialized, there's going to be conflicts" (Niss, 2012, para. 12).

Three principles aimed to "protect academic integrity" (Carter, 2012, para 2) including institutional openness, educational responsibility, and mission consistency were presented to the Board of Trustees by an informal group of faculty ("A statement of," 2012). By adhering to these three principles, the group hoped the university could work towards a stronger sense of unity between the athletic department, faculty, and university at large in order to better the educational experiences and opportunities for all student-athletes (Carter, 2012).

National Intercollegiate Athletics Reform Efforts

Reform of intercollegiate athletics precipitated and catalyzed the formation of the NCAA. In the early 1990's, "the emphasis on intercollegiate athletic reform was driven by university Presidents" ("The role of the faculty," n.d., para. 1). More recently, prominent national reform groups including the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics, the Coalition on Intercollegiate Athletics (COIA), the Drake Group, and the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) have become involved in reform (Ridpath, 2008).

The Johns S. and James L. Knight Foundation created the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics in 1989 in response to multiple highly visible scandals within Division I collegiate athletics with an initial goal “to recommend a reform agenda that emphasized academic values in an arena where commercialization of college sports often overshadowed the underlying goals of higher education” (“About Knight Commission,” n.d., para. 1). The primary purpose of the commission is to promote transparency for athletic departments to ensure “integrity in both financial and academic policies” (“About Knight Commission,” n.d., para. 3). In 1991, the Knight Commission published, “Keeping Faith with the Student-Athlete: A New Model for Intercollegiate Athletics,” which promoted a *one-plus-three model* (“A call to action,” 2003, p. 10). The model pushed for Presidential control, which would lead to academic and fiscal integrity to be verified with an extensive certification process (“A call to action,” 2003). The reform group has worked extensively with faculty from across the country to work towards their stated mission to “balance both academics and athletics” (“About Knight Commission,” n.d., para. 2).

The most recent formation of a faculty reform group was COIA, developed in 2002 after Pac Ten and Big Ten faculty senate presidents felt that there needed to be “cohesion among all campus faculty governance committees to create a united voice in intercollegiate athletic reform efforts” (“The coalition,” 2003, para. 2). The stated purpose of the organization is to “articulate a broad national faculty voice in support of reform efforts, to contribute ideas towards a successful long-term strategy for reform, and to work with other groups committed to ensuring that athletics enhances rather than undermines the academic mission” (“Framing the Future,” 2003 , para. 1). The COIA steering committee has established five areas in need of reform within intercollegiate athletics including academics, athlete welfare, finances and scale, commercialization, and governance (“Framing the Future,” 2003).

The Drake Group, described by former NCAA President Dr. Myles Brand as a group of “self-appointed radical reformers and incorrigible cynics...consisting of a small number of faculty members with an eye for publicity” (Smith, 2011, p. 191), formed in the early 1990’s when Professor Jon

Ericson, of Drake University, organized a group of faculty pushing for athletic reform from institutions across the country (“The Drake Group, n.d.). Mr. Ericson became involved in faculty reform because he felt that Drake University had academic majors, which focused solely on maintaining athletes’ eligibility. Mr. Ericson published a report titled “While the Faculty Sleep” to expose the faculty and administration at Drake University for their involvement in this academic dishonesty. (Smith, 2011, p. 191). Although the first meeting of this group consisted of faculty with varying ideas for reform and no consistent proposals, the group ultimately concluded “faculty representatives and faculty themselves needed to have substantially more power and authority” (“The history of,” n.d., para. 1).

The stated mission of the Drake Group is “to help faculty and staff defend academic integrity in the face of the burgeoning college sport industry” (“The Drake Group,” n.d., para. 1). The Drake Group's national network of college faculty lobby aggressively for proposals that promote “quality education for college athletes, support of faculty whose job security is threatened for defending academic standards, and disseminates information on current issues and controversies in sport and higher education” (“The Drake Group,” n.d., para. 1). Currently, the Drake Group consists of faculty members from universities across the country in varying divisions and conferences within the NCAA and looks for Faculty Senate groups and other campus governing bodies to work with the athletic department to decrease the “widening gap” between athletics and academics.

This faculty-led reform group has three stated proposals to improve the “academic integrity of college campuses and to return control of the classroom back to the faculty” (“The history of,” n.d., para 1). The three-prong approach includes ensuring academic transparency, academic priority, and academic-based participation. Within each of these three proposals, there are specific steps, which the Drake Group has established, to work towards their stated mission (“The history of,” n.d.).

Lastly, the AAUP was founded after Professor Edward Ross was fired from Stanford University after speaking out on policies pertaining to immigrant labor and railroad monopolies (“History of the AAUP,” n.d., para. 1). Philosopher Arthur Lovejoy of Johns Hopkins University

heard of the incident and organized a meeting in 1915 to create an organization that deals with academic freedom and prevalent issues for university faculty members. The AAUP describes itself as “the voice of the profession” (“History of the AAUP,” n.d., para. 4).

The stated mission of the AAUP is “to advance academic freedom and shared governance, to define fundamental professional values and standards for higher education, and to ensure higher education's contribution to the common good” (“AAUP: Mission,” 2010, para. 1). The AAUP has stated, “College athletics in this country are a continuing crisis” (“The role of the faculty,” n.d., para. 1). Although the organization has heavily criticized the role of college athletics within the academy, the AAUP has worked in congruence with the NCAA. For example, in 2003, the AAUP, NCAA, and COIA held a conference to “explore the challenges of collaboration” (Smith, 2011, p. 195). The conference was meant to explore teamwork and examine methods of creating a stronger relationship between faculty and the NCAA (Smith, 2011).

The AAUP has general principles to define faculty responsibility in the governance of intercollegiate athletics. The 1996 “Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities,” published by the AAUP has four main principles. The statement stresses full disclosure of information about the institution’s athletic program, faculty’s responsibility in educating each athlete, faculty’s involvement in the policy-making aspects of the athletic department, and establishing a relationship between the faculty and outside governing bodies (“Statement on,” 1990). Although each reform group has unique and distinct suggestions and proposals for reform, it is clear that faculty/staff are most concerned with the academics (standards, performance, and integrity), governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics. The issues and efforts for reform on the campus of UNC-CH are a microcosm of the greater landscape of intercollegiate athletics.

Faculty Perceptions of Intercollegiate Athletics

Several previous studies have investigated faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletics at Division IA institutions. A 1988 study investigated “Faculty Perceptions of Athletics at Division IA Universities” (Sherman, Weber, and Tenago). The survey results and analysis showed that the general

attitude of faculty towards athletics was mixed. Based on further analysis of the data, three main conclusions were drawn. First, faculty indicated a belief that athletics are an important, but not an essential part of higher education. The faculty also voiced a belief that athletic personnel, not just faculty, should assume the primary responsibility of assisting student-athletes in achieving academic success. Lastly, faculty did ultimately believe their opinions counted in decisions about the relationship between academics and athletics, but not necessarily in other athletically related policy and decision-making (Sherman, Weber & Tenago, 1988).

In 2006, the Knight Commission sponsored a study examining Division I-FBS faculty perceptions of intercollegiate athletic programs (Lawrence, Hendricks, & Ott). The survey was organized around academics, governance, and finance issues pertaining to intercollegiate athletics. This study revealed that a large number of faculty members were most pleased with aspects of academics, as the respondents indicated they had a positive experience in working with student-athletes, and believed student-athletes demonstrated academic integrity in their studies. Another significant finding was the faculty who were involved in athletics-related governance at their particular institution had much higher satisfaction with all aspects of intercollegiate athletics. Lastly, faculty members were displeased with the range of faculty perspectives considered by central administrators and the extent to which the entire faculty had input in developing policy for intercollegiate athletics (Ott, 2011). The mixed results from the aforementioned studies indicate that the changes seen within collegiate athletics have not affected the varied views that many faculty/staff have on pertinent issues.

Theoretical Framework

In order to guide the examination of employee satisfaction of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH, this study was framed utilizing three philosophical viewpoints which describe generally accepted staff and faculty issues and assumptions that divide institutional reformers and reform groups within Division I institutions. The differentiation in philosophical viewpoints will allow for understanding of the varied responses pertaining to particular intercollegiate athletic issues from the faculty/staff at UNC-CH. The three reform groups, as constructed by Sack (2009), include intellectual elitists,

academic capitalists, and athletes' rights advocates. The basis of differentiation between the philosophies stems from assumptions regarding three main issues: the relationship of commercialism to academic values, the legal status of athletic scholarships, and the mission of higher education (Sack, 2009).

Intellectual Elitism.

The intellectual elitist model maintains that highly commercialized athletics have a negative effect on our current higher education system and an institution of higher education should simply consist of scholars and students (Gerdy, 2006). Academic elitists argue that the extravagant resources used in the never-ending arms race of intercollegiate athletics could be used for academic purposes rather than lavish athletic-related facilities (Gerdy, 2006).

The role of athletics within the academy, as related to intellectual elitism, is founded on the idea that competitive athletics is a means of enhancing the education of the athletes via on field competition. (Gerdy, 2006b). These faculty members also believe that scholarships should be given based on financial need or academic-related merit and should be controlled by the university and not the coaches of the athletes' particular sport. Having the coaches involved in the scholarship process allows the coaches to set the academic priorities for the athletes and may allow for student-athletes to be admitted with lower credentials, which undermines the academic integrity of the institution (Sack & Staurowsky, 1998; Dowling, 2007).

Academic Capitalism.

The conceptual model of academic capitalism can be directly related to the increasing commercialization of intercollegiate athletics in higher education (Sack, 2008). The late president of the NCAA, Dr. Myles Brand, supported the academic capitalism model and believed that the athletic department is a core aspect of the academy and revenue associated with athletics is a healthy by-product of quality athletic education. The revenue generated from the athletics department is in fact worthwhile, as it is being used as a source of funding for scholarships and department infrastructure (Brand, 2006d).

Academic capitalists believe that the mission of higher education should include career preparation, as well as intellectual studies and as such, extra-curricular activities are equally valuable to in-class studies (Sack, 2008). Academic capitalists therefore stress the educational value of an athletic scholarship. Dr. Brand, one of the main proponents and spokespeople for academic capitalism, understands that other students with “special talents” are admitted to institutions of higher education, as are exceptional athletes. Like other students, those who are admitted with exceptional talents also are given particular advantages, including academic support and eligibility standards (Brand, 2006d).

Pertaining to the relationship of commercialism to academic values, academic capitalists believe that all athletes are amateurs. This means that athletes are not employees of the institution, but rather students receiving an opportunity to participate in meaningful extracurricular activities. Dr. Brand stated, “There are ...clear distinctions between the collegiate and professional models of athletics. Professional sports’ sole purposes are to entertain the public and make a profit for team owners. The purpose of the collegiate model is to enhance the educational development of athletes” (Brand, 2006a). Commercialism does not hurt academic value, as long as the commercialism does not prevent a meaningful educational experience for all athletes (Sack, 2008).

Athletes’ Rights.

The last subset of faculty reform includes athletes’ rights advocates. Those advocating for the student-athlete argue that collegiate sport is “commercial entertainment” and that will most likely not change in the near future. These faculty members believe the NCAA supports a free market for every party but the athletes. Commercialism has become “deeply embedded” in collegiate athletics, yet the system gives no opportunity for the athletes to be involved in such commercialism and deprives the athletes of rights that other stakeholders have (Sack & Stauirowsky, 1998).

Athletes’ rights advocates believe that amateurism is simply a myth and that athletes are both university employees and students. As employees at the institution, athletes should be eligible for workers’ compensation and receive a share of the revenues in which they help to produce (McCormick

& McCormick, 2006; Sack & Staurowsky, 1998). Athletes' rights advocates believe that athletic scholarships undermine the academic values that should be the priority for student-athletes. Similar to intellectual elitism, it is viewed that because coaches control financial aid, they will set the academic priorities for the athletes low, and simply ensure that their athletes remain academically eligible for athletic participation (Sack & Staurowsky, 1998).

In terms of the mission of higher education, those associated with athletes' rights believe that athletes deserve the same educational opportunities as all other students. However, if these athletes are working like employees, then they are clearly deprived of all of the educational and intellectual opportunities that an institution offers. The mission of higher education is not being fulfilled if the student-athlete is both an employee and a student at the same time (Sack, 2008). Dr. Sack's framework allows for an understanding of the variety of viewpoints on issues within collegiate athletics and provides a lens that the faculty/staff perceptions of athletics on the UNC-CH campus can be viewed.

Significance of the Study

This study examined employee satisfaction with specific aspects of academics (standards, performance, and integrity), governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH. The data gathered provides an understanding of underlying issues of discord that need to be discussed if we are to form a foundation for strengthening the relationship between athletics and the academy. Discourse is necessary in fostering a relationship between athletics and the rest of the universities, to not only enhance the experience for the student-athletes, but to better the entire UNC-CH campus. The analysis of employee satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH can also be a model for engaging faculty and staff in necessary dialogue at other institutions.

Research Questions

1. How satisfied are employees with the academic standards, performance, and integrity of intercollegiate athletics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill?

2. How satisfied are employees with the governance of intercollegiate athletics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill?
3. How satisfied are employees with the financing of intercollegiate athletics at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill?
4. Do selected demographic factors (4a- 4f) influence employee satisfaction related to academics, governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH?
 - a. Gender
 - b. Race
 - c. Role in Athletic Governance
 - d. Attendance at home Olympic sporting events
 - e. Attendance at home Men's basketball games
 - f. Attendance at home football games

Assumptions

1. It is assumed that all respondents surveyed were truthful and accurate with their survey responses.
2. The completion of the survey was voluntary for all participants.

Methodology

Instrument Design

The instrument utilized in this study was based on the survey used in the Knight Commission study (2006). The original survey was developed in three phases. Discussions about the content commenced with a meeting of a faculty advisory committee convened by the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics in September of 2006. Prominent themes that evolved during this meeting were then discussed in interviews with faculty and members of the provost's office on five campuses that differed in size, location and control throughout November, 2006- February, 2007. A questionnaire was then drafted based on previous research, advisory committee discussion, the

interviews, and documents from groups such as the AAUP, COIA, and the NCAA. The draft questionnaire was piloted with project advisors from the Knight Commission on Intercollegiate Athletics and a group of faculty from the University of Michigan from January of 2007 to April of 2007 (Ott, 2011).

The instrument for the present study was adapted, with permission from the authors to fit particular characteristics of the athletic department and university as a whole to better survey the employees at UNC-CH. Modifications were reviewed by a panel of experts in an effort to maximize content validity. This panel included two UNC-CH professors, a Senior Staff member in the UNC-CH athletic department, the initial drafter of the Knight Commission Study, a survey methodology expert from The Howard W. Odum Institute for Social Science, and two Sport Management faculty members from other institutions.

The survey included both Likert-scale and open-ended questions organized around three theoretically distinct yet interrelated aspects of intercollegiate athletics and the general campus climate: academics, governance, and finance. Academic items inquire about admissions and advising policies and practices as well as students' academic performance and faculty colleagues' attitudes toward student-athletes. Governance items assess faculty involvement in and satisfaction with general campus decision-making bodies such as faculty senates and with athletics-specific governance roles and committees such as FARs and campus athletic advisory committees. Faculty views of campus leadership, including the president and athletics administrators, are also examined. Finance items focus on faculty satisfaction with campus priorities that guide budgetary decisions for the campus generally and intercollegiate athletics specifically, and commercial intercollegiate activities. In all cases, faculty/staff were advised to frame their responses based upon the UNC-CH campus, classes, and local colleagues.

Data Collection

The population of interest was University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill (UNC-CH) faculty and staff to determine their satisfaction and concerns pertaining to academics (standards, performance,

and integrity), governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH. The study was approved by UNC-CH's Institutional Review Board and the appropriate steps were taken to ensure confidentiality for each survey respondent. The surveys were distributed online via Qualtrics using the UNC-CH employee listerv. According to the Office of the Chief Information Officer, the survey was sent to 9,104 employees. The survey yielded a response rate of 6.36% after 579 employees responded.

Quantitative data were analyzed utilizing Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Data analysis included basic frequencies and descriptive statistics to gather the demographic information of survey respondents and cumulative satisfaction means for each survey question. One-way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were run to determine whether or not there was a significant relationship between any of the independent variables and Likert-scale satisfaction items.

Qualitative data was coded separately by the primary researcher and a member of the thesis committee and organized into six coding categories with eighteen subcategories. Inter-coder reliability for the six coding categories was 91%. This means that both coders agreed on 91% of the coding of the content of interest within an application of the same coding scheme.

Results

The majority of survey respondents were white (72%) women (57%) with 6% of respondents Black/ African American, and the remaining 22% of respondents identifying with "other" races/ ethnicities, including Asian, Native Hawaiian, Pacific Islander, Hispanic/Latino, American Indian, and Alaska Native. Employee attendance at home football, Men's basketball, and Olympic sporting events during the 2011-2012 seasons was also measured. Frequency analysis indicated that 59% of respondents indicated they attended 0 football games, 39% attended 1 - 4 games, and 2% of all respondents attended 5 - 7 games. Data analysis also showed that 52% of the sample had attended 0 home Men's basketball games, while 40% attended 1 - 12 games, and 8% attended 13 - 18 games. Olympic sporting events were the least attended based on the survey's sample, as 60% attended 0 events, 37% attended 1 - 10 events, and 3% attended 11 - 20 or more events. Lastly, survey respondents were asked to identify whether they have been involved in governance role that pertains to

intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH, with 6% (n=38) indicating that they have served in such a capacity, while 93% (n=541) have not been involved in any form of athletic governance role. Please see Table 1 for a complete list of sample demographic information.

Academic Performance, Standards, and Integrity

Descriptive statistics were tabulated to examine satisfaction with academic performance, standards, and integrity. Cumulative satisfaction means indicate that UNC-CH employees are more “dissatisfied” with admissions standards for football players compared to both Men’s basketball players and Olympic sport athletes. An average satisfaction level of 3.32 (SD= 1.65) on a scale ranging from (1) “very dissatisfied” to (5) “very satisfied,” shows the survey sample to be “somewhat dissatisfied” with the admissions standards specific to football players. The lowest satisfaction levels were indicated in the areas of student-athlete academic integrity (M= 2.58, S= 1.944) and academic performance (M= 2.63, S= 1.93), where employees were between “somewhat dissatisfied” and “neutral” on these particular issues. Interquartile range figures are presented as mean values do not necessarily reflect the sentiment of this population as there was significant variance. Five measures had quartiles at both extreme values with the the first quartile of responses “very dissatisfied” and the third quartile “very satisfied”. Standard deviations at or near the 2.0 mark reflect this extreme variance. Analysis of variance revealed significant differences on select dependent variables when analyzed by gender, athletic governance role, home men’s basketball attendance, home football attendance, and home Olympic sport attendance as presented in Table 2. Select significant findings will be discussed.

There were significant differences for the factor of gender among faculty/staff members. There were significant differences in the satisfaction level of faculty and staff members with the academic integrity of non-student-athletes ($F(1, 446) = 5.30, p = 0.022$) and student-athletes ($F(1, 441) = 5.69, p = 0.017$), with a significance level set at $p \leq 0.05$. The satisfaction level with non-student-athletes (M= 2.92, SD= 1.96) and student-athletes (M= 2.63, SD= 1.93) had low cumulative

means and employees were “very to somewhat dissatisfied” with the academic integrity of UNC-CH students. White employees ($M= 4.10$) were significantly more satisfied than their black/African American counterparts ($M= 3.35$) with admissions standards for Olympic sport student-athletes with a mean difference of 0.749 ($F(2,459) = 5.20, p= 0.035$).

Overall, 38 respondents had participated in an athletic governance role on campus, past or present; while, 541 respondents had never been in such a role. Those who currently or have previously participated in an athletic governance role were more “satisfied” with all aspects of academic standards, performance, and integrity. Statistical testing indicated significant differences with the satisfaction level of the academic integrity ($F(1, 479)= 4.17, p= 0.042$) and performance ($F(1, 471)= 7.625, p= 0.006$) of student-athletes, as well as the satisfaction level with faculty efforts to engage student-athletes ($F(1, 474)= 8.08, p= 0.005$) and non-student-athletes ($F(1, 483) = 9.86, p= 0.005$) to ensure the quality of the educational experience.

Significant differences were found in the satisfaction level of UNC-CH employees with the academic and athletic balance among those who attended home Men’s basketball, football, and Olympic sporting events. Those employees who attended 0 home football games ($M= 3.34, SD=2.03$) were less satisfied with the academic and athletic balance on campus versus those who attended 5 - 7 games ($M= 3.75, SD=1.28$). There were clear distinctions in employee views pertaining to the academic and athletic balance when examining home Men’s basketball attendance. The average satisfaction level of attendees of 0 games was 2.87 ($SD= 1.42$) versus an average of 4.05 ($SD = 1.10$) for those employees who attended 13 - 18 games, with a significant interaction, $F(2, 494) = 13.74, p= 0.000$, and mean difference of -1.77. This is the greatest significance and largest mean difference among all factors examined. Analysis of academic standards, performance, and integrity is presented in table 2.

Governance

Respondents’ levels of satisfaction varied widely in terms of the governance of intercollegiate athletics, with moderate means between 3.06 ($SD= 1.42$) and 3.58 ($SD= 1.86$) and large standard

deviations. Despite the variance in responses, only one significant difference was uncovered with the independent variables tested related to the institutional control of intercollegiate athletics and home Men's basketball attendance. Basketball game attendees were more "satisfied" with the institutional control of intercollegiate athletics than those who did not attend any home Men's basketball games. A one-way ANOVA yielded a significant interaction of $F(2,471) = 4.43, p = 0.022$ and mean difference of -0.360. Result may be seen in table 3.

Finance

Cumulative satisfaction means ($M = 2.96, SD = 1.33$) indicate that UNC-CH employees are between "somewhat dissatisfied" and "neutral" with the balance struck on campus between the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics and the ideals of amateur athletics. Analysis of variance uncovered significant differences related to only one independent variable. Those who attended 13 - 18 games were more satisfied with the allocation of resources on campus ($M = 3.81, SD = 1.43$), the awarding of athletic scholarships ($M = 4.19, SD = 1.39$), and the balance between commercialization and the amateur ideal of intercollegiate athletics ($M = 3.54, SD = 1.41$).

Pertaining to the satisfaction levels for the allocation of resources on campus, practice of awarding athletic scholarships, and balance between commercialization and amateurism on campus there was a significant difference in those who attended 0 home Men's basketball games versus those who attended 1 - 12 and 13 - 18 games. When comparing the allocation of resource on campus for those who attended 0 versus 13-18 Men's basketball games, the Tukey Post-Hoc test yielded a p-value of $F(1, 457) = .470, p = 0.003$. In each case, there was a large mean difference of -0.788, -0.788, and -0.766 respectively, meaning those who attended more games were more satisfied with the finance of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH. Statistical results pertaining to financial issues are presented in table 4.

Qualitative General Concerns

In an open-ended question at the end of the survey, respondents were invited to express "general concerns with intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH." Three hundred and thirty seven (337)

employees responded to the qualitative section. The six coding categories emerged including 1) nothing; 2) power of intercollegiate athletics; 3) commercialization of intercollegiate athletics; 4) student-athlete experience; 5) academic performance, standards, and integrity; and 6) institutional issues with 18 related sub-categories.

Out of 337 respondents, 18.69% of employees expressed no concerns with collegiate athletics. Faculty/staff expressed their greatest concerns with “institutional issues” at UNC-CH, as 23.74% of all respondents identified specific issues, including the reputation of UNC-CH. One employee noted, *“The integrity and reputation of UNC have been harmed by the excessive emphasis on the need for high performance in the revenue sport”* (Respondent 102). Another employee stated, *Athletics plays way too strong a role at UNC and occupies way too much time and effort. The latest scandals have justifiably diminished the prestige of UNC... ”* (Respondent 110).

There were also strong sentiments expressed about the commercialization of intercollegiate athletics on campus, with 16.62% of respondents expressing concerns about the increased spending and commercialization. Respondent 4 discussed resource allocation on campus stating, *“Disparity in financial priorities within the university with academics getting very little.”* There were also statements pertaining to coaches’ salaries and increased commercialization, as one UNC-CH faculty/staff member was concerned with *“Ads all over the Smith Center monitors and the salaries and benefits of coaches”* (Respondent 130).

Academics (20.77%) and the student-athlete experience (14.54%) were also major themes in concerns expressed. One UNC-CH employee stated, *“I think athletes are given academic passes that are unfair both to other students and ultimately to the athlete because they do not get the kind of education they otherwise could”* (Respondent 19). Admissions standards were also a major theme of concern. Respondent 36 stated expressed concerns with *“Student-athletes being accepted to the university solely on athletic ability,* while respondent 38 was concerned with the *” number of admissions exceptions made in recent years for student-athletes.”*

Many of those surveyed were concerned with the student-athlete experience at UNC-CH, including exploitation by the university and the pressure (time and winning) on all student-athletes. For example, respondent 89 stated, *“We pretend these athletes are actually students. They are not-they are being used by UNC (for generating money and prestige) and they are essentially training camps for the NFL and NBA. We do a severe disservice to these students-most will not go on to professional athletic career-and by not providing them with a real educational college experience is further exploitation for these students.”* Racial stereotypes were also included in the discussion of exploitation, as a UNC-CH employee noted *“The exploitation of young black men”* (Respondent 151) as a major concern with intercollegiate athletics. The pressure from fans and coaches to win was another concern expressed in the open-ended portion of the survey. Respondent 64 stated, *“It’s impossible for student-athletes in major sports to be serious students, given their required time commitments to sports.”* Analysis of qualitative responses can be found in table 5.

Discussions and Implications

Academic Standards, Performance, and Integrity

Survey results and analysis indicated that UNC-CH employees’ satisfaction with academics (standards, performance, and integrity), governance, and finance was mixed. This study yielded similar results to the 1988 study “Faculty Perceptions of Athletics at Division IA Universities,” where mixed results made it difficult to make conclusions on faculty/staff views of intercollegiate athletics (Sherman, Webster, & Tenago, 1988). Considering this study occurred directly after a major NCAA and internal investigation, it is interesting that the mixed results were similar to the 1988 study. It would seem that a major NCAA violation might skew the results negatively in most aspects of the survey.

Congruent to the findings in Sherman, Webster, and Tenago, survey respondents were most “dissatisfied” with academic standards, performance, and integrity of student-athletes. However, faculty in the 2006 Knight Commission study characterized student-athletes in general as “motivated

and prepared and do not perceive student athlete's as lacking academic integrity" (Hendricks, Lawrence, & Ott, 2006, p. 26). The "dissatisfaction" with academics, particularly academic integrity in this study, may be attributed to the NCAA's investigation and subsequent penalties for violations by the football program. The perceptions of faculty/staff seem to be related to the investigation and violations, as those were based in academics. Open-ended responses indicate that many faculty/ staff feel that academic reputation of the university after the "scandal" has been tarnished, and that all aspects of academics relating to intercollegiate athletics must be examined, including admissions and performance standards for student-athletes.

Although there was "dissatisfaction" with academic standards, performance, and integrity of student-athletes, results indicate those who are more involved in athletics, whether that be as a fan/consumer or an employee who has been involved in athletic governance, were more "satisfied" than their peers in terms of all aspects of academics involving student-athletes. It may be that those who are attendees at UNC-CH sporting events or have worked in athletically related governance subscribe to the notion of "academic capitalism" (Sack, 2008).

The "academic capitalist" model describes an educational benefit to collegiate sports participation. The late President of the NCAA Myles Brand noted, "The purpose of the collegiate model is to enhance the educational development of athletes" (Brand, 2006a). Like Dr. Brand, other academic capitalists believe that the mission of higher education should also be to emphasize career preparation, as well as intellectual studies. This means that extra-curricular activities have as much value as the in-class studies, and many with special talents may need academic advising and differing admissions standards to benefit the institution (Sack, 2008).

Those who attend or work closely with athletics may see their benefits first-hand, which ultimately led to higher levels of satisfaction for these particular respondents. Even though there may be differing admissions standards or increased academic advising for student-athletes, this subset of faculty/staff understand that student-athletes bring unique talents to the campus, and gain unique educational opportunities that translate into career and life-after-college preparation. It is also possible

that those who attend UNC-CH sporting events or participate in athletically-related governance are simply fanatics, who are not interested in the well-being of the student-athlete, and only concern is winning and as such do not view or care whether injustice or exploitation is transpiring.

Governance

Similar to the findings in Sherman, Weber, and Tenago (1988), UNC-CH employees were also “satisfied” with their input into athletic and non-athletic decisions; however, they were not satisfied with the level of cooperation to uphold academic standards or institutional control over athletics. Although these findings were similar, this may indicate the general landscape of intercollegiate athletics, as UNC-CH has been investigated and sanctioned for specific issues pertaining to academics.

When UNC-CH was sanctioned by the NCAA for violations committed by the football program, the university did not receive a notice that they “lacked institutional control,” which is a major infraction. There were discussions by the media, prior to the notice of violations from the NCAA, however, that UNC-CH may have “lacked institutional control,” (Barnes, 2010, para. 2) which may have impacted the perception of these issues for many faculty/staff. Qualitative analysis indicated a perception by the employees that the “scandal” was an outcome of lack of oversight by the Chancellor, Athletic Department, and athletically related governing bodies. Media influence may have impacted levels of satisfaction, as it may have been many faculty/staff’s only exposure to information regarding the investigations and violations.

Finance

Results found in Sherman, Weber, and Tenago (1988) and the 2006 Knight Commission Study showed that employees were “dissatisfied” with the balance struck between commercialization and the ideal of intercollegiate athletics on campus, similar to the findings at UNC-CH. Based on

results in a 1988 and 2006 study, it is clear that commercialization of intercollegiate athletics is an issue that has spanned multiple decades.

As spending and commercialization increase, it seems as if this is an issue that will continue to cause “dissatisfaction” among UNC-CH employees and other faculty/staff across the country. As noted by Sack, the “intellectual elitist” model for reform maintains the extravagant resources that are used in the arms-race of intercollegiate athletics could be used for academic purposes rather than lavish facilities (Gerdy, 2006). These respondents, like intellectual elitists, may think this commercialization has a negative effect on our current higher education system and UNC-CH should only consist of scholars and students (Sack, 2008).

“Athlete’s rights” advocates believe that the commercialization has become “deeply embedded” in intercollegiate athletics and the commercialization deprives student-athletes of the opportunity to receive compensation (Sack, 2008). The exploitation of student-athletes was a concern for a portion of faculty/staff in their open-ended responses. Both subsets may be represented heavily in the survey sample due to the “dissatisfaction” with the balance between commercialization and the ideals of amateur within collegiate athletics. It may be that those who do not attend sporting events do not see that the student-athlete experience is enhanced via great facilities and enthusiastic support, but rather that commercialism and increased spending on intercollegiate athletics serves no purpose on a university campus (Sack, 2008).

Future Research and Recommendations

This is the first study of its kind where faculty/staff at a single FBS Division IA university were surveyed for their perceptions of intercollegiate athletics after a major NCAA investigation and subsequent violations. The low response rate represents a major limitation with the findings as only a small subset of the population was represented. Based on the percentage of respondents who attended games and served on athletics-related committees, these respondents when compared to the sample population are over represented and as such may not be representative of all UNC-CH employees.

Future research examining issues on a single campus might provide incentives to the survey population for an increased response rate. Another idea would be to develop a series of focus groups to ensure a more representative sample of the university's faculty/staff. This study also presents an opportunity for non-response bias. Based on the large standard deviations representative of large variance in responses, it is likely that many of the respondents were those with high levels of support or disdain for the current operating model, thus only the more extreme positions were captured as evidenced in the passionate narrative responses.

If a researcher were to utilize a similar survey instrument in the future to study an institution post- NCAA investigation, it would be worthwhile for a qualitative/open-ended section to ask about the change in perception and attention paid to intercollegiate athletics before and after the incident. Future studies may also want to include athletic department employees in their survey sample; they are institutional employees and employment within collegiate athletics does not necessarily mean all viewpoints are positive.

Ultimately, the study of employee satisfaction of academics (performance, standards, and integrity), governance, and finance of intercollegiate athletics at UNC-CH reinforces the findings in previous studies that at Division IA institutions general attitudes towards intercollegiate athletics are mixed. The athletic department and other governing bodies should still utilize specific findings as talking points to foster a cooperative environment on campus. The study's results make it clear that those who attend athletic events or participate in athletically related governance roles at UNC-CH have more positive views of intercollegiate athletics. UNC-CH employee's first-hand experience of working with the athletic department or attending home sporting events has created a more positive perception of athletics at UNC-CH.

It is also necessary for the university to continue to ensure that all faculty/staff, no matter their particular viewpoint, are invited and welcomed to participate on all athletics committees. Involvement in an athletically related committee may allow a faculty/staff member to improve their perception or simply engage in necessary discourse. As discussed in Hendricks, Lawrence, and Ott (2006), it might

also be worthwhile for the academy and athletics to create unique athletically related governing committees pertaining to a wide-array of issues, meaning having separate committee to discuss issues, such as the finance of intercollegiate athletics. New committees, with varying topics and discussions can be developed to foster even more discussion.

There is also clearly a need to increase faculty/staff attendance at sporting events because those who did not attend events were less “satisfied” with intercollegiate athletics. Men’s basketball and football are not free admission for non-athletic department personnel, so it might be valuable to create faculty/staff nights or honor particular departments and function units at UNC-CH sporting events. Increasing faculty/staff involvement with athletics provides an opportunity to improve a relationship that benefits all constituencies at UNC-CH.

Table 1

Demographic Information

	%	n
Gender		
Male	43.30%	202
Female	56.70%	264
Age		
Under 30-50	45.20%	211
51-60	33.20%	155
61-80+	21.60%	101
Race/ Ethnicity		
White	86.90%	405
Black	7.30%	34
Other	5.80%	27
Administrative Responsibilities?		
Yes	28.60%	128
No	71.40%	319
Teaching Responsibilities?		
Yes	55.70%	251
No	44.30%	200
Level of Education		
Doctorate	43.60%	202
Other	56.40%	261
Home Football Attendance		
0 Games	58.50%	336
1 to 4 Games	39.40%	226
5 to 7 Games	2.10%	12
Home Men's Basketball Attendance		
0 Games	51.90%	300
1 to 12 Games	40.30%	233
13 to 18 Games	7.80%	45
Home Olympic Sport Attendance		
0 Games	59.80%	336
1 to 10 Games	37.20%	208
11 to 20 + Games	3.20%	18
Athletics Governance Role (Past or Present)?		
Yes	6.60%	541
No	93.40%	38

Note. Other includes those who identified as mixed race. Teaching responsibilities include those who are Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, and Instructors/ Lecturers. Olympic Sports include all varsity sports other than football and men's basketball.

Table 2

Employee Satisfaction of Academic Performance, Standards, and Integrity of Intercollegiate Athletics at UNC-CH

	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	F	p	IQR 25	IQR 75
Admission Standards- Football	3.32	1.648				2	4
Admissions Standards- Men's Basketball	3.48	1.671				2	5
Admissions Standards- Olympic Sports	3.98	1.738				3	5
<i>White vs. Black</i>			0.749	5.201	0.035		
Academic Integrity- Non Student-Athletes*	2.96	1.913				1	5
<i>Male vs. Female</i>				5.297	0.022		
Academic Integrity- Student-Athletes*	2.58	1.944				1	5
<i>Male vs. Female</i>				5.693	0.017		
<i>Athletic Governance Role</i>				4.168	0.042		
Academic Performance- Non Student-Athletes*	2.92	1.959				1	5
<i>Male vs. Female</i>				5.66	0.018		
<i>Athletic Governance Role</i>				9.862	0.002		
Academic Performance- Student-Athletes*	2.63	1.930				1	4
<i>Male vs. Female</i>				7.613	0.006		
<i>Athletic Governance Role</i>				7.625	0.006		
Quality of Educational Experience- Non Student-Athletes*	3.33	1.998				1	5
<i>Athletic Governance Role</i>				8.088	0.005		
Quality of Educational Experience- Student-Athletes*	3.10	2.118				1	5
<i>Athletic Governance Role</i>				8.075	0.005		
Academic vs. Athletic Balance*	3.11	1.416				2	4
<i>Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 1 to 12 Games</i>			-0.352	13.47	0.019		
<i>Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 13 to 18 games</i>			-1.777		0.000		
<i>Basketball Attendance 1 to 12 games vs. 13 to 18 games</i>			-0.825		0.002		
<i>Olympic Sport Attendance- 0 vs. 11 to 20+ games</i>			-0.887	3.571	0.047		
<i>Football Attendance- 0 vs. 5 to 7 games</i>			-0.317	5.638	0.010		

Note: Scale from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree

Tested for significant differences based on independent variables of gender, age, race/ethnicity, administrative responsibilities, teaching responsibilities, level of education, home football/men's basketball/ Olympic sport attendance, and athletic governance role.

Mean difference denotes mean from first subcategory listed minus second subcategory.

* $p \leq .05$

Table 3

Employee Satisfaction of Governance of Intercollegiate Athletics at UNC-CH

	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	F	<i>p</i>	IQR 25	IQR 75
Level of Cooperation to Uphold Academic Standards	3.26	1.782				2	5
Role of Faculty in Governance	3.42	1.780				2	5
Institutional Control*	3.06	1.420				2	4
<i>Basketball Attendance- 0 vs 1 to 12 games</i>			-0.360	4.431	0.022		
Chancellor Oversight*	3.30	1.502				2	4
<i>Male vs. Female</i>				5.220	0.023		
Faculty Input- Campus Decisions	3.45	1.675				2	5
Faculty Input- Athletic Decisions	3.25	1.759				2	5
Governance by Opposing/ Dissenting Faculty	3.58	1.856				2	5

Note: Scale from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree

Tested for significant differences based on independent variables of gender, age, race/ethnicity, administrative responsibilities, teaching responsibilities, level of education, home football/men's basketball/ Olympic sport attendance, and athletic governance role.

Mean difference denotes mean from first subcategory listed minus second subcategory.

* $p \leq .05$

Table 4

Employee Satisfaction of Finance of Intercollegiate Athletics at UNC-CH

	Mean	SD	Mean Difference	F	<i>p</i>	IQR 25	IQR 75
Allocation of Resources*	3.26	1.345				2	4
<i>Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 1 to 12 games</i>			-0.415	8.739	0.004		
<i>Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 13 to 18 games</i>			-0.778		0.003		
Practice of Awarding Athletic Scholarships*	3.59	1.541				2	4
<i>Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 1 to 12 games</i>			-0.415	7.347	0.010		
<i>Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 13 to 18 games</i>			-0.778		0.003		
Commercialization of Intercollegiate Athletics*	2.96	1.327				2	4
<i>Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 1 to 12 games</i>			-0.304	6.848	0.044		
<i>Basketball Attendance- 0 vs. 13 to 18 games</i>			-0.766		0.003		

Note: Scale from (1) Strongly disagree to (5) Strongly agree

Tested for significant differences based on independent variables of gender, age, race/ethnicity, administrative responsibilities, teaching responsibilities, level of education, home football/men's basketball/ Olympic sport attendance, and athletic governance role.

Mean difference denotes mean from first subcategory listed minus second subcategory.

* $p \leq .05$

Table 5
Open-Ended Concerns

Category	N = 337	% Respondents
Power of Intercollegiate Athletics	31	9.20
<i>Influence of Donors</i>		
<i>NCAA's Power</i>		
<i>Power of Football</i>		
Student- Athlete Experience	49	14.54
<i>Quality of Education</i>		
<i>Exploitation (racial stereotypes)</i>		
<i>Pressure (time, winning, coaches)</i>		
<i>Separation of football/basketball players</i>		
Commercialization	56	16.62
Nothing	63	18.69
Academics	70	20.77
<i>Integrity</i>		
<i>Performance</i>		
<i>Academic/Athletic Balance</i>		
<i>Academic/ Admissions Standards</i>		
Institutional Issues	80	23.74
<i>Educational Mission</i>		
<i>Lack of Faculty Support</i>		
<i>Reputation after "Scandal"</i>		
<i>Oversight/Governance/Accountability</i>		
<i>Eliminate From University</i>		
<i>Public Relations</i>		

References

- A call to action: Reconnecting college sports and higher education: Knight commission on intercollegiate athletics.* (2003) John S. & James L. Knight Foundation: Miami, FL.
- A statement of principles for athletics at UNC.* (2011). Retrieved from http://www.wralsportsfan.com/asset/colleges/unc/2012/02/17/10746599/A_statement_of_principles_for_Athletics_at_UNC.pdf
- AAUP: Mission and description.* (2010, May 26). Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/about/mission/>
- About.* (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.knightcommission.org/about/about-background>
- Academic support program for student-athletes.* (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://cssac.unc.edu/athletic-counseling-program>
- Anthes, R. (2010, March 7). Rutgers 1000 fights big spending as focus drifts from academics. *The Daily Orange*. Retrieved from <http://www.dailyorange.com/2.8655/rutgers-1000-fights-big-spending-as-focus-drifts-from-academics-1.1240226>
- Barnes, G. (2010, October 12). Defining 'lack of institutional control'. Retrieved from <http://www.wralsportsfan.com/unc/story/8442723/>
- Bergman, B. (2009, November 06). *By a 91-68 vote, academic senate tells cal athletics to pay its own way — starting now.* Retrieved from http://berkeley.edu/news/media/releases/2009/11/06_athletics.shtml
- "Big-time sports and the university: A conversation with Joe Nocera of the New York Times".* (2012, May 14). Retrieved from <http://history.unc.edu/big-time-sports-and-the-university-a-conversation->
- Brand, M. (2006). The role and value of intercollegiate athletics in universities. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 33, 9-20.
- Brand, M. (2006a, January 9). 2006 NCAA State of the Association Address. Retrieved May 3, 2007, from <http://www.i-aa.org/articleprint.asp?articleid=75346>.
- Brand, M. (2006b, April 24) Commercialism controlled when activity aligns with mission. *NCAA News*, p. 3.
- Brand, M. (2006c). Interview by author, May 23, 2006.
- Brand, M. (2006d, November 13). Letter from Myles Brand to William Thomas, Chairman, House Committee on Ways and Means, retrieved November 20, 2006, from <http://www.ncaa.org>.
- Brown, G. (2007). Faculty group's effort targets integration of athletics. *The NCAA News*.
- Carter, A. (2012, February 17). UNC faculty members want athletic department to pursue academics. *News and Observer*. Retrieved from <http://www.newsobserver.com/2012/02/17/1863092/unc-faculty-members-want-athletic.html>.

- Championship history*. (2012). Retrieved from <http://www.tarheelblue.com/sports/m-baskbl/spec-rel/111402aab.html>.
- Cockley, W.T & Roswell, G.M. (1994). A comparison study of faculty members' perceived knowledge and satisfaction regarding NCAA athletic programs. *Journal of Sport Behavior*. 17(4), 217.
- Collegiate sports topic of panel discussion Feb. 28*. (2012, February 2). Retrieved from <http://www.lib.unc.edu/blogs/news/index.php/2012/02/collegiate-sports-panel>.
- Curtis, D. (2012, April 21). North Carolina football violations outlined in NCAA notice of allegations. *The Sporting News*, Retrieved from <http://aol.sportingnews.com/ncaa-football/feed/2010-08/unc-investigation/story/north-carolina-football-facing-several-serious-ncaa-violations>.
- Department of athletics mission statement*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.tarheelblue.com/genrel/092601aad.html>.
- Desarbo, W. (2009, December 21). *Measuring fan avidity can help marketers narrow their focus*. Retrieved from <http://www.sportsbusinessdaily.com/Journal/Issues/2009/12/20091221/From-The-Field-Of/Measuring-Fan-Avidity-Can-Help-Marketers-Narrow-Their-Focus.aspx>
- Dowling, W.C. (2007). *Confessions of a spoil sport: My life and hard times fighting sports corruption at an old eastern university*. University Park: The Pennsylvania State Press.
- Duderstadt, J. (2003). *Intercollegiate athletics and the American university: A university president's perspective*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Faculty and staff data: Office of institutional research. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://oira.unc.edu/facts-and-figures/faculty-and-staff-data/faculty-and-staff-data.html>
- Fassin, Y. (2008). The stakeholder model refined. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 70(12), 1-46.
- Framing the future: Reforming intercollegiate athletics. White paper presented by the Coalition of Intercollegiate Athletics (2007, June 15). Retrieved from <http://www.neuro.uoregon.edu/~tublitz/COIA/index.html>
- Gerdy, J.R. (2006, May12). For true reform, athletic scholarships must go. *Chronicle of Higher Education: The Chronicle Review*. 52(36), B6.
- Hartness, E. (2012, March 13). *UNC faculty working to engage athletes more in class*. Retrieved from <http://www.wral.com/news/education/story/10852217/>.
- History of the AAUP*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/about/history/>
- History of the NCAA*. (2010, November 8). Retrieved from [http://ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/ncaa/about the ncaa/who we are/about the ncaa history](http://ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/ncaa/about%20the%20ncaa/who%20we%20are/about%20the%20ncaa%20history)
- Hofstadter, R. (1963). *Anti-intellectualism in American life*. New York: Vintage Books.

- Jawahar, I. M., & McLaughlin, G. (2001). Toward a descriptive stakeholder theory: An organizational life-cycle approach. *Academy of Management Review*, 26(3), 397-414.
- Lawrence, J., Ott, M., & Hendricks, L. (2009). *Athletic reform and faculty perceptions*. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 2009(148), 73-81.
- Litterer, D. (2011, August 17). *Women's soccer history in the USA: An overview*. Retrieved from <http://homepages.sover.net/~spectrum/womensoverview.html>.
- Longman, J. (2009, May 29). *As costs of sports rise, students balk at fees*. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2009/05/30/sports/30colleges.html>.
- McCormick, R.A., & McCormick, A.C. (2006). The myth of the student-athlete: The college athlete as employee. *Washington Law Review*, 81, 71-157.
- Minnick, B. (2009, March 20). Heels merchandise head and shoulders above the rest. . Retrieved from <http://www.wral.com/news/local/story/4775639/>.
- Mission and statement of principles*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.knightcommission.org/about/mission-statement>
- Niss, S. (2012, February 27). UNC athletic director responds to faculty statement on athletics and academics. *The Daily Tar Heel*.
- Office of the President*. (2010, October 5). Retrieved from [http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/NCAA/NCAA_President/On the Mark](http://www.ncaa.org/wps/wcm/connect/public/NCAA/NCAA_President/On_the_Mark)
- Ott, M. (2011). Faculty satisfaction with intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 4, 370
- Pickeral, R. (2012, December 20). *Unc probe reveals academic fraud*. Retrieved from http://espn.go.com/college-sports/story/_/id/8765672/north-carolina-tar-heels-investigation-reveals-academic-scandal-african-american-studies-department
- Putler, D. & Wolfe, R. (1999). Perceptions of intercollegiate athletic programs: Priorities and tradeoffs. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 16(4), 301-325.
- Ridpath, B. D. (2008). *Can the faculty reform intercollegiate athletics? A past, present, and future perspective*. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 1, 11-25. Retrieved from http://csri-jiaa.org/documents/puclications/research_articles/2008/JIIA_2008_1_Can the Faculty_Publish.pdf
- Sack, A.L. & Staurowsky, E.J. (1998). *College athletes for hire: The evolution and legacy of the NCAA's amateur myth*. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Sack, A.L (2008). *Counterfeit amateurs: An athlete's journey through the sixties to the age of academic capitalism*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Sack, A.L. (2009). Clashing models of commercial sport in higher education: Implications for reform and scholarly research. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 2, 76-92.

- Schoonmaker, A. (2012, May 5). *UNC report reveals widespread problems in afro-studies department* . Retrieved from <http://www.wral.com/news/local/story/11064527/>
- Sherman, T. M., Weber, L. J., & Tenago, C. (1988). An investigation of faculty perceptions of athletics at division IA universities. 1-17. Retrieved from <http://eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED323859.pdf>
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (1997). *Academic capitalism: Politics, policy, and the entrepreneurial university*. Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press.
- Slaughter, S., & Leslie, L. (2001). Expanding and elaborating the concept of academic capitalism. *Organization Overviews*, 8(2), 154-161.
- Slaughter, S., & Rhoades, G. (2004). *Academic capitalism and the new economy: Markets, state, and higher education*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smith, R. (2011). *Pay for play: A history of big-time college athletic reform*. (pp. 187-197). Urbana, Chicago, and Springfield, Illinois: University of Illinois Press.
- Southall, R. M., & Nagel, M. S. (2009). Big-time college sport's contested terrain: Jock capitalism, educational values, and social good. *Human Kinetics Sport Management News*, Retrieved from <http://www.humankinetics.com/news-and-excerpts/news-and-excerpts/big-time-college-sports-contested-terrain-jock-capitalism-educational-values-and-social-good>.
- Statement on government of colleges and universities*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/contents/governancestatement.htm>
- Tar Heel memorabilia sales benefit student scholarships*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.unc.edu/news/archives/mar97/money.html>.
- The coalition on intercollegiate athletics (COIA)*. (2003, October 20). Retrieved from <http://www.sc.edu/faculty/PDF/COIA.oct2003.pdf>
- The drake group proposals*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.thedrakegroup.org/proposals.html>
- The history of the drake group*. (n.d.). Retrieved from <http://www.thedrakegroup.org/history.html>
- The role of the faculty in the governance of college athletics*. (n.d.) Retrieved from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/comm/rep/athgov.htm>
- The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*. (2012). Retrieved from <https://www.med.unc.edu/anesthesiology/welcome/our-department/the-university-of-north-carolina-at-chapel-hill>.
- Thelin, J. (1996). *Games colleges play: Scandal and reform in intercollegiate athletics*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Thompson, M. (2011, September 1). UNC outperforms new NCAA academic progress rate standards. *The Daily Tar Heel*. Retrieved from http://www.dailytarheel.com/index.php/article/2011/08/unc_outperforms_new_ncaa_academic_progress_rate_standards.

- Toma, D. (1999). The collegiate ideal and the tools of external relations: The uses of high-profile intercollegiate athletics. *New Directions for Higher Education*, 105, 81-90.
- Tysiac, K. (2011, September 20). UNC puts its football team on probation, forfeits wins. *The News and Observer*. Retrieved from <http://www.newsobserver.com/2011/09/20/1503041/unc-puts-its-football-team-on.html>.
- UNC, Nike sign new 10-year contract. (2009, July 7). Retrieved from <http://alumni.unc.edu/article.aspx?sid=6840>.
- Wolverton, B. (2008). Rise in fancy academic centers for athletics raises questions of fairness. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A14.